4) dbaṅ po min, Q 93a6, D 181a2 anindriya non-faculty	idem	
5) zin pa, Q 93a8, D 181a3 upādinna grasped	ma zin pa, Q 93a8, D 181a3 anupādinna ungrasped	rnam par phye ba, Q 93b2, D 181a4 *vibhatta to be distinguished (?)
6) bstan du med pa thogs pa med pa Q 93b5, D 181a7 anidassana-appatigha invisible and non-obstructive	idem	
7) raṅ bźin gyi gzugs, Q 93b7, D 181b1 sabhāva-rūpa intrinsic form	idem	mtshan ñid kyi gzugs, Q 94a2, D 181b3 lakkhaṇa-rūpa characterising form

PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES XII[1]

TEN PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random group of words which are either omitted from PED,[2] or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there, or misunderstood by translators.

    1. (*a*)*pi*; emphatic particle
    2. *abhijāna* "knowledge"
    3. *assa* = *yassa*
    4. *kañcana* "golden"
    5. *kañcanadepiccha* "golden two-winged one"
    6. *khuddā* "bee", *khudda*(*ka*) "honey"
    7. *je*: vocative particle
    8. *dhoreyya* "foremost"
    9. *bārasa* "twelve"
    10. *sadhāyamānarūpa* "abusive"

1. (*a*)*pi*: emphatic particle

We find at D III 203,22 the sentence *api ssu naṃ mārisa amanussā rittam pi pattaṃ sīse nikkujjeyyuṃ*, which is translated by Rhys Davids

---

[1] See K.R. Norman, "Pāli Lexicographical Studies XI", in *JPTS* XVIII, 1993, pp. 149–64.
[2] Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS(D) = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Dictionary); CP I, II, III, IV = K.R. Norman, *Collected Papers*, Vols. I, II, III, IV, PTS 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993; MW = M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakaṃ Concordance*; AMg = Ardha-Māgadhī; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; GDhp = Gāndhārī Dharmapada; B^e = Burmese edition; C^e = Sinhalese edition; E^e = European edition; cty/cties = commentary/ commentaries.

as: "They would bend down his head like an empty bowl".[1] Walshe gives the identical translation,[2] which can hardly be coincidence. It seems likely that both translators have mistaken *pi* for *va*. Rhys Davids was possibly translating "by intuition", thinking that he knew what the text meant, and translating accordingly, even though the Pāli cannot possibly mean what he says.

Both Pāli *pi* and Skt *api* can have an emphatic meaning. It is commonly used in this sense after numerals, where it gets the sense of "exactly". That is the sense at 203,23 "exactly seven pieces". At 203,20 *pi* emphasises *attāhi* "full indeed" and at 203,22 it emphasises *rittaṃ* "empty indeed". The translations quoted above also mistake the cases of *pattaṃ* and *sīse*, and take the wrong noun as the object of *nikkujjeyyuṃ*. The meaning is "they would turn an empty pot upside down on his head". The cty makes this clear by explaining that when the pot was put on his head it slipped down as far as his neck — we would probably say "down on to his shoulders". They would then hit the pot, with his head still inside it.

I believe that the same emphatic use of *pi* occurs at 203,19: *api ssu naṃ mārisa amanussā anāvayham pi naṃ kareyyaṃ avivayhaṃ* "they would make him unmarriageable indeed" with regard to both *āvāha* and *vivāha*. My only doubt here is the form of the sentence with *naṃ* coming twice without *ca* or *vā*: "they would make him not suitable for *āvāha*, (they would make him) him not suitable for *vivāha*".

---

[1] T.W. and C.A.F. Rhys Davids (tr.), *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part III, 1921, p. 195.
[2] Maurice Walshe (tr.), *Thus have I heard*, London 1987, p. 477.

2. *abhijāna* "knowledge"

At Mil 78,13, as one of the sixteen (actually seventeen[1]) ways in which *sati*[2] arises, we find the statement *abhijānato pi mahārāja sati uppajjati*, and in response to the question *kathaṃ abhijānato sati uppajjati* (Mil 78,23) there is the answer: *yathā mahārājja āyasmā ca Ānando Khujjuttarā ca upāsikā ye vā pan' aññe pi keci jātissarā jātiṃ saranti, evaṃ abhijānato sati uppajjati.*

Rhys Davids translates[3] *abhijānato* as "by personal experience", and Miss Horner "from personal experience", and PED lists *abhijāna* as "recognition, remembrance, recollection", and gives an etymology from *abhijñāna*, although this might have been expected to develop > *abhiññāna* in Pāli, since *abhijñā* develops > *abhiññā*. It is possibly for this reason that CPD does not list *abhijāna* as a noun, but maintains that *abhijānato* is the masculine genitive of the present participle of the verb *abhijānāti*. This is, of course, formally possible, and the phrase in Mil would then mean "*sati* arises to/for one knowing, i.e. one having knowledge".

It is not clear how far the interpretation of this section of Mil is to be connected with the discussion which occurs in the section which immediately precedes it: *sabbā sati abhijānantā uppajjati udāhu kaṭumikā vā sati ti. abhijānantā pi mahārāja sati uppajjati, kaṭumikā pi sati ti. evaṃ hi kho bhante Nāgasena sabbaṃ satiṃ abhijānanti, n' atthi kaṭumikā sati ti* (77,32–78,4). Rhys Davids translates *abhijānantā*

---

[1] See T.W. Rhys Davids, *The Questions of King Milinda*, I, Oxford 1890, p. 123 note 17.
[2] Miss Horner (*Milinda's Questions*, I, London 1963, p. 106 note 4) translates *sati* as "mindfulness", which is its usual meaning in Buddhist contexts. Rhys Davids is more likely to be correct in giving the word the common meaning of Skt *smṛti* "memory".
[3] Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

uppajjati as "arises subjectively", while Miss Horner translates it as "arises knowing objectively". Trenckner stated (Mil p. 422) that Mil 78,1 was corrupt, without making it clear whether he thought that the corruption extended over more than one line. Miss Horner follows Mil-ṭ in reading *sabbā sati abhijānantā uppajjati* in Mil 78,3, which certainly fits in with the earlier passage and is easier to understand, although it is not at all clear how the corruption, if it is one, came about.

If we are correct in taking Mil 78,13–14 as meaning "*sati* arises from knowledge, *sati* arises from *kaṭumikā*", then we have to explain why at Mil 78,1–2 we seem to have a different statement: "*sati* arises knowing, *sati* arises *kaṭumikā*". It is to overcome this difficulty that *kaṭumika* is normally taken as an adjective "connected with *kaṭumikā*, caused by *kaṭumikā*" in the first passage, and as a feminine noun in the second.[1] There are many words in Pāli which are both nouns and adjectives, but the fact remains that we should normally expect an adjective from the noun *kaṭumikā* to have some indication that it is an adjective, e.g. a suffix with or without strengthening of the first syllable. Even if we ignore this problem we still have the difference between "*sati* arises knowing" and "*sati* arises from knowledge".

It is, of course, possible to take *abhijānantā sati uppajjati* as a direct parallel to *abhijānato sati uppajjati*, since *abhijānantā* can be the ablative of *abhijānanta*, which may be either a genuine compound of *abhijāna*

---

[1] Rhys Davids translates the adjective "stirred up by suggestion from outside" and "artificial", and the noun "outward aid". Miss Horner takes *kaṭumikā* in both sections as a noun, and translates the first passage as "mindfulness is an artificial aid". CPD (s.v. *kaṭumikā̆*) says that it is impossible to translate *kaṭumikā* in the first passage as if it were a noun. It is clearly not impossible to do so — Miss Horner has done it. Whether it is correct to do so is another matter. As will be seen below, I too take it as a noun, but I differ from Miss Horner in the way in which I interpret it. I think that the meaning is something like "external aid", as opposed to internal knowledge.

---

and *anta*, or an example of *abhijāna* with *-anta* added pleonastically.[1] If this is correct, then we have the problem of *kaṭumikā [uppajjati] sati*. Once again, this problem is not insuperable, since we may take *kaṭumikā* as a "truncated" ablative of the noun *kaṭumikā*, where *-ā = -āya*.[2] If we make these assumptions, then the statements in the two sections are completely parallel.

It is not clear why CPD does not list *abhijāna* as a noun. To take *abhijānato* as a present participle when it is followed by *kaṭumikāya*, which is presumably an ablative, and fifteen other quasi-ablative forms in *-ato*, seems very perverse. CPD does list *abhijānana*, i.e. an action noun formed from the present stem of the verb *abhijānāti* with the *-ana* suffix, and there seems to be no reason for rejecting the formation of an *a*-stem noun from the same root. I assume, therefore that PED is correct in taking *abhijāna* as a noun, but incorrect in implying that it is to be derived from *abhijñāna*.[3]

3. *assa = yassa*

We find in Dhp 179 the following:

> *yassa jitaṃ nāvajīyati*
> *jitaṃ assa no yāti koci loke,*
> *taṃ buddhaṃ anantagocaraṃ*
> *apadaṃ kena padena nessatha.*

---

[1] See K.R. Norman, *The Group of Discourses*, Vol. II, p. 174 (ad Sn 127).

[2] See W. Geiger, *Pāli Grammar*, § 81.

[3] Note Karashima's suggestion that *Buddha-yāna* may be derived from **Buddha-jāna = Buddha-jñāna*. See S. Karashima, *The textual study of the Chinese versions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in the light of the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions*, Tokyo 1992, p. 266 and *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the occasion of his 89th Birthday*, Vol. II, Beijing 1991, pp. 607–43.

It is difficult to analyse *assa* in pāda b, or to translate it, as anything other than a relative pronoun — which is what all translations available to me do. In the explanation the cty does the same: *noyātī ti na uyyāti yassa jitaṃ kilesajātaṃ rāgādisu ekakileso pi loke pacchato-vatti nāma na hoti nānubandhatī ti* (Dhp-a III 197,17–19). If we assume that the cty and the translators are correct in understanding the sense of a relative pronoun here, then it is possible to take *assa* as a genuine relative pronoun form. We could assume that it is an eastern form, without initial *y-*,[1] which was not recognised as such when the Pāli, or some earlier, recension was made.

It is interesting to note that the parallel version at Udāna-v XXIX.52 in Bernhard's edition[2] reads the first two lines as:

> *yasya jitaṃ nopajīyate*
> *jitam anveti na kaṃ cid eva loke.*

Unfortunately Nakatani's edition[3] is defective here. If we could be certain that the Udāna-v redactor received something approximating to the Pāli version, then the differences between the Pāli version and the Udāna-v would seem to show an attempt to solve the problem of *assa* by omitting it, so that pādas a and b are both part of the clause introduced by *yasya*. That is, in effect, an admission that *assa* is to be taken as a relative pronoun.

---

[1] See K.R. Norman, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", *IIJ* X, 1967, pp. 160–70 (pp. 165–67) (= CP I, pp. 47–58 [pp. 52–54]).
[2] Franz Bernhard (ed.), *Udānavarga*, Band I, Göttingen 1965.
[3] H. Nakatani (ed.), *Udānavarga de Subaśi*, Paris 1987.

4. *kañcana* "golden"

CPD states that *kañcana* as an adjective is found only in compounds. This is to ignore Alsdorf's suggestion[1] that at Ja VI 269,5* we should read *kañcane* rather than *kañcana-maye*. The latter reading is unmetrical, and to overcome this problem CPD suggests reading *kañcanā-maye* m.c. This overlooks the fact that as emended in this way the pāda is an even (posterior) Vaitālīya pāda where an odd (prior) one is required.

Alsdorf suggested reading *nagare nimmite kañcane*, giving the scansion ˘ ˘ – ˘ – ˘ ˘ –, and he believed that this stood for ˘ ˘ | – ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ – –, with two short syllables contracted to a single long syllable (and presumably a long syllable resolved into two short syllables), giving the cadence ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ – instead of the usual – ˘ ˘ ˘ –. I cannot parallel this anywhere else in a Vaitālīya verse in Pāli. An emendation which might be thought to be more acceptable, because it comprises changes which are frequently found, is: *nagare nimmītĕ kañcane*, giving the scansion ˘ ˘ | – – – | ˘ ˘ – –.

If the suggestion is correct that Pāli *kañcana*, like Skt *kāñcana*, can be both noun and adjective, then *kañcana-maya* would be a gloss upon *kañcana*, i.e. "golden" means "made of gold", with *-maya* extracted from the gloss *suvaṇṇamayaṃ* (Ja VI 270,12′). The gloss had then replaced *kañcana* in the text.

5. *kañcanadepiccha* "golden two-winged one"

This word occurs in the verse *yaṃ na kañcanadepiccha andhena tamasā gataṃ / tādise sañcajaṃ pāṇaṃ kam atthaṃ abhijotaye*, Ja V 339,19*–20*, and is glossed: *yaṃ nā ti ettha nakāro upamāne, kañcanadepicchā ti kañcanadvepiccha* (v.l. *-dopiccha*), *ayam eva pāṭho kañcanasadisa-*

---

[1] L. Alsdorf, "Das Jātaka von weisen Vidhura", *WZKS* XV, 1971, pp. 23–56 (p. 31).

ubhayapakkhā ti attho. tamasā ti tamasi gatan ti katam, ayam eva vā pātho, purimassa nakārassa iminā sambandho, na katan ti katam viyā ti attho, 341,19'. The pāda is quoted at Sadd 889,10, where the compound has the form *kañcanadvepiñcha.* It is noteworthy that three spellings of the middle element of the compound are found, i.e. *-de-, -dve-, -do-.* The form *-de-* was doubtless preferred to *-dve-* m.c., to give the cadence ᵕ – – ᵕ .

It is not unknown for translators and lexicographers to be uncertain about the meaning of a word and to be obliged to give possible alternatives. It is, therefore, not altogether surprising that the editors of the CPD, finding it difficult to be certain about the meaning of *kañcanadepiccha,* should give two possible meanings for the word.[1] What is surprising is the way in which they present their explanations. The two editors not only give two separate signed explanations, but they are mutually contradictory, even to the extent of giving different abbreviations for the Jātakamālā. One explanation states that the Skt parallel in the Jāt-m shows that the first pāda must contain a verb, the other refutes this by claiming that the Jāt-m has been reformulated. One explanation depends upon a belief that the original form of the verse had *kañcana-d-ev' icche* (although no translation is given for this), while the other explanation requires the original form of the middle element of the compound to be *-do-,* from a *vṛddhi* form **dovijja* with the same meaning as *duvija < dvija.* One of the few agreements in the two explanations is the fact that both assume that *-p-* has arisen from *-v-.*

In view of the doubt about the meaning of this word, it will perhaps not be inappropriate to give yet another suggestion, arising from the fact that neither of the attempts made in CPD suggests a reason for the cty explaining *piccha* as *pakkha.* We may deduce that, since there are no

---

[1] *A Critical Pāli Dictionary,* edited by Oskar v. Hinüber and Ole Holten Pind, Vol. III, Fascicle 1, pp. 29–30.

grounds for doubting that the cty tradition knew the usual meaning of the word *piccha* as "tail feather",[1] there must have been some special reason for saying that here it meant *pakkha.* Sadd 782,7–8 specifically gives this explanation: *kañcanavaṇṇā dve picchā dve pakkhā yassa haṃsarājassa so 'yaṃ kañcanadvepiccho.* The reason for this was presumably the fact that the cty tradition had handed this meaning down.

It is not difficult to suggest a cause for this. I would suggest that here we have the western development of *kṣ* in *pakṣa > cch,* as opposed to the usual eastern *kkh.* The resultant *paccha* developed > *piccha* by the palatalisation of *-a- > -i-* before *cch,*[2] and the tradition which Sadd 889,10 was following replaced this by the alternative *piñcha,* for which the v.l. *viñca* in Cᵏˢ is not an unreasonable variant.

The verse presents other problems. The cty states that the first *na* (*purimassa nakārassa*) has here the meaning of *viya,* a view shared by Sadd. Smith, however, in his edition of Sadd, and Oskar von Hinüber (= OvH) take *andhena* at Ja V 339,19* as two words. That produces two occurrences of the word *na* in the line, of which only one can be equal to *viya,* but OvH's suggested translation shows no trace of the other *na* being translated as a negative. Moreover, since *tamasā* is an instrumental, although explained as *tamasi* in the cty,[3] we presumably need *andhena* as an instrumental to parallel it. The meaning of the verse might then be: "O golden two-winged one, abandoning (i.e. if you abandon) your life in such circumstances, what profit, which is covered (reading the v.l. *katam* for *gatam*) as it were by blinding darkness, would you make clear ?" In other words: "Please tell me what profit there would be in your

---

[1] Although both MW and PED quote the lexical meaning "wing" for Skt *piccha.*
[2] See K.R. Norman, "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIII: The palatalisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan", *JOI*(B) XXV, 1976, pp. 328–42 (p. 333) (= CP I, pp. 220–37 [p. 226]).
[3] Note *tamasīva* at Jāt-m 134,8.

sacrificing your life. I can see no profit in it at all. If there is any profit, it is completely hidden from me, as though covered in darkness".

6. *khuddā* "bee", *khudda(ka)* "honey"

Although *khuddā*, *khudda* and *khuddaka* are not included in PED, the first two are listed in Childers, who quotes Abh 494 821 (nt.) "honey" and 645 (fem.) "bee", and *khudda* is quoted in PTC and by Geiger[1] (*khudda* "honey" Ja VI 582,30* = Skt *kṣaudra*). MW quotes Skt lex. *kṣaudra* "honey, species of honey" from *kṣudrā* "a kind of bee".

I cannot quote any occurrence of *khuddā* in Pāli literature, but *khudda* occurs three times in the same phrase in the Aggañña-suttanta of the Dīgha-nikāya. It is not clear why the PTS edition prints the phrase in three different ways: *seyyathā pi nāma khudda-madhu anelakaṃ, evaṃ assādā ahosi*, D III 85,16; *khuddaṃ madhuṃ anelakaṃ*, 87,6; *khudda-madhu-anelakaṃ*, 87,23. It is glossed: *khuddaṃ madhun ti khudda-makkhikāhi kataṃ madhuṃ*, Sv 866,8.

The same phrase occurs in the Vinaya: *seyyathā pi khuddamadhuṃ anīlakaṃ evam assādaṃ*, Vin III 7,9. This is glossed: *khuddaṃ madhun ti khuddamakkhikāhi katamadhuṃ*, Sp 182,17. It also occurs in the Aṅguttara-nikāya: *seyyathā pi nāma khuddaṃ madhuṃ anīlakaṃ*, A III 369,9 (*khuddaṃ madhun ti khuddamakkhikāhi kataṃ daṇḍakamadhuṃ*, Mp III 385,25). At Mp III 314,9 *khuddamadhu* occurs with *aneḷakaṃ* in the gloss on *aggarasa* at A III 237,14. There is a reference to the same simile in the Majjhima-nikāya: *seyyathā pi puriso catummahāpathe khuddaṃ madhuṃ anelakam pīḷeyya*, M II 5,8 (*khuddaṃ madhun ti khuddamakkhikāhi katadaṇḍakamadhuṃ*, Ps III 237,19).

---

[1] Geiger, § 15.4

It would appear that the correct form of the compound is *khuddamadhu*, i.e. it is the type of honey called "*khudda*", as opposed to any other sort of *madhu*: *madhu nāma makkhikāmadhū ti, madhukarīhi nāma madhu-makkhikāhi, khuddakamakkhikāhi bhamaramakkhikāhi ca kataṃ madhu*, Sp 715,14.

The word also occurs, in the simplex form or in compounds, in the Jātaka and Apadāna: *phalāni khuddakappāni bhuñja* "fruits like honey" Ja IV 434,8* V 324,2* (*khuddakappānī ti etāni nānārukkhaphalāni khudda-madhupaṭibhāgāni madhurāni*, 324,11') VI 85,27* 93,10* 532,30* 542,26* 569,18*; *dajjā ammā brāhmaṇassa phalaṃ khuddena missitaṃ*, Ja VI 555,15* (*khuddena missitan ti tañ ca khuddaka-madhunā missitaṃ*, 555,29'); *imaṃ muḷālavaṭakaṃ sālukaṃ piñjarodakaṃ bhuñja khuddehi saṃyuttaṃ saha puttehi khattiya*, Ja VI 563,8* (*idaṃ sabbaṃ khuddamadhunā saṃyuttaṃ puttehi saddhiṃ bhuñja*, 563,27'); *madhuñ ca khuddaṃ anuttaraṃ bhesajjaṃ patthayantā*, Ap 7,21; *madhuṃ yathā khuddam iva ssavantaṃ*, Ap 13,30.

It is not clear whether *khuddaka-madhu* has the same meaning as *khudda-madhu*, or whether here *khuddaka* has the sense of "connected with honey, i.e. a bee". In *madhukarīhi nāma madhumakkhikāhi, khuddakamakkhikāhi bhamaramakkhikāhi ca kataṃ madhu* (Sp 715,14), *khuddaka* can either be taken as parallel with *madhu*, or with *bhamara*. In favour of the former it should be noted that Skt *kṣaudraka* means "honey", i.e. it has the same meaning as *kṣaudra* and the suffix *-ka* is *svārthe*, so it is probable that the same is true of Pāli *khuddaka*.

7. *je*: vocative particle

This particle seems to be used when addressing women of an inferior class, and its use has recently been examined by OvH. He states that it is used when speaking to slave girls, except for one occasion when it is used to a daughter-in-law, which is perhaps indicative of the status of a

daughter-in-law. We should, however, note that it is also used when speaking to the courtesan Ambapāli.

The following are all the occurrences of this particle in Pāli known to me:

kissa je (to Ambapālī) Vin I 232,2 ≠ *kiñ je* D II 96,14

dehi je (to Ambapālī) Vin I 232,5 = D II 96,19

handa je Vin I 269,13; 271,35; IV 162,4

gaccha je Vin I 291,3,14,26; 292,15

sace je (contrasted with *yagghe 'yye* Vin III 15,35; M II 62,13) Vin III 15,36; M II 62,15 (*je ti ālapane nipāto, evaṃ hi tasmiṃ dese dāsijanaṃ ālapanti, tasmā: hambho dāsi ...*, Sp 209,4 = Ps III 297,1); Vv-a 187,22, 26

ye je sve Vin III 161,31 (*ye je ti ettha je ti dāsiṃ ālapati*, Sp 580,24)

he je (to a daughter-in-law [*ghara-suṇhā*]) Vin IV 21,3 foll.; M I 125,18,28; 126,1 (*he je Kāḷī ti are Kāḷi*, Ps II 99,7)

kiṃ je M I 125,18,28; 126,1; Vv-a 207,10

bhoti je Dhp-a IV 105,6

je Ap 420,2 (E^e so [probably wrong reading]; B^e S^e *te*)

OvH says that *je* is in contrast to standard Middle Indic *ayye*, but it is not clear what this means. In Pāli texts it is in contrast to Pāli *ayye*, but this statement seems to exclude such eastern dialects as AMg, where *ayye* would appear in the form *ajje*. As we shall see, the early usage of *je* was probably in an eastern dialect.

OvH suggests[1] that "most probably *je* is an abbreviated form of **ajje*" (= *ayye*, i.e. the vocative feminine from < *āryā*), but later in the same article he expresses his view as certainty: "*re* is derived from *are*, in the same way as *je* is from **ajje*". It is, however, not easy to see how something

---

[1] Oskar von Hinüber, "From colloquial to standard language: the oral phase in the development of Pāli", *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-neuve 1993, pp. 101–13 (p. 101).

derived from *ārya* could be used in this pejorative sense,[1] in contexts where it is contrasted with *ayye* (e.g. Vin II 15,35; M I 125,18,19,28; 126,1; II 62,13) nor is it obvious why **jje* should lose its first *j-*.[2] Itse use as a feminine particle is probably, as L.A. Schwarzschild suggests, because *-e* was taken as the vocative of an *-ā* stem, cf. *haṃje*.[3]

I think that OvH is on surer ground with the suggestion that there is a connection with the particle *je* found in Pkt infinitives ending in *-uṃ je*. This had already been suggested by L.A. Schwarzschild in her discussion of Pkt *je,* and she had given more references[4] than the single one given by OvH, and referred to earlier discussions of the particle in this usage. I have suggested elsewhere that the Pāli equivalent of this *je* is *ye*, also found with infinitives in Pāli.[5] It is possible that this particle can be seen in the emphatic particle *yeva* < *ye + eva*.[6] It also occurs in the Aśokan inscriptions.[7]

---

[1] If *re* is to be derived from *are*, then its pejorative sense would arise from the fact that it is identical in form, and perhaps in derivation, with the vocative of *ari* "enemy".

[2] If the particle is an abbreviation, then we might see *ye* as a shortened form of *aye*, which occurs in Skt as well as *ayi*, but this suggestion is unlikely to be correct unless there is evidence for **aje, *aji* in an eastern dialect.

[3] L.A. Schwarzschild, "The indeclinable *je* in Middle Indo-Aryan", *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, 20–21/1–4, 1961, pp. 211–17 (p. 216).

[4] For further examples of its usage see Thomas Oberlies, *Āvaśyaka-Studien 2, Glossar ausgewählter Wörter zu E. Leumanns "Die Āvaśyaka-Erzähhlungen"*, Stuttgart 1993, p. 78, s.v. *je*.

[5] See K.R. Norman, *Elders' Verses* II, PTS London, 1971, ad Thī 418. It is interesting to note that Thī-a 268,9 glosses *kātuye* as *kātuṃ ayye*, showing that the commentator was not acquainted with the particle *ye*. There is no comparable *ayye* in the explanation of *marituye* at Thī-a 269,20 (ad Thī 426). The context excludes such an explanation of *ye* in *hetuye* (Bv II.10; *bhavituṃ*, Bv-a 69,29) and *ganetuye* (Bv IV.28; *ganetuṃ saṅkhātuṃ*, Bv-a 152,18).

[6] Note also *nirodhe ye vimuccanti*, It 46,1; 62,10 (*ye ti nipātamattaṃ*, It-a II 42,21).

[7] K.R. Norman, "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", *IIJ* X, pp. 160–70 (p. 162) (= CP I, pp. 47–58 [pp. 48–49]).

It is very likely that *j*- in *je* is the same *j*- as in *jantāghara*, i.e. initial *y*- > *j*-, which we find consistently in the relative pronoun in some dialects of MIA. If this is so, then both words would be borrowings from the same eastern dialect, or related dialects, used at an early stage of the Buddhist tradition, and the rareness of the sound change at such an early date probably caused problems for the translators.

The Pāli hyper-form *Yamataggi* < *Jamadagni* shows that the redactor was aware of a dialect where initial *y*- became *j*-, which led to his replacing the historically correct *j*- by *y*-, presumably because the name *Jamadagni*, doubtless in the form **Jamadaggi*, was not known to him.[1]

I therefore find it difficult to agree with OvH in his interpretation of *je* as being evidence for a development from the colloquial to the standard language, and as representing the oral phase in the development of Pāli. It seems to me that *je* in Pāli (with the other words I have mentioned above with initial *j*- < *y*-) represents a relic from an earlier eastern dialect in which the texts in which it occurred, or the tradition behind them, at one time existed and from which they had been translated. Whether they were colloquial words (if this is used in the sense of belonging to familar speech, as opposed to formal or elevated language) or not seems to me to be unprovable, since I know of no evidence which would help us to come to a decision. The examples of *je* with an infinitive occur in Jain literature, and therefore represent a literary usage which can be classified as formal.

The existence of such words in Pāli arises from the fact that for some reason the Pāli redactor did not recognise them as words to be translated, and consequently left them in their eastern form. That the need to translate was sometimes recognised is shown by the occurrence of the hyperform *Yamataggi*. The fact that *je* and the other words OvH mentions (*mahallaka*, *āvuso*) do not occur in BHS texts shows that the redactors

---

[1] John Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London 1962, p. 249 (ad GDhp 237).

of those texts did recognise that they were inappropriate to the dialects into which they were translating, and they therefore replaced them by forms which were more appropriate.

8. *dhoreyya* "foremost"

At Dhp 208 we find *dhorayha(-sīla)* (glossed *dhuravahana-sīlatāya*, Dhp-a III 272,10) used as an epithet of the Buddha. PED suggests an etymology < **dhorvayha* = Skt **dhaurvahya*, as an abstract noun from *dhurvaha* "carrying a yoke". The idea of carrying a yoke was strong in the cty tradition: *dhorayha-sīlin* at Ja II 97,16* is glossed *dhura-vahanaka-ācārena sampanna* (97,19'–20').

We should note the following passages: *dhuravahanatthena dhorayho*, Spk I 80,20 (ad *dhorayho*, S I 28,21); *viriyam me dhura-dhorayham*, S I 173,1* (glossed: *dhura-dhorayhan ti dhurāyam dhorayham, dhuram vahatī ti attho*, Spk I 255,5); *purisa-dhorayhena*, D III 113,18 (glossed: *purisa-dhorayhenā ti yā asama-dhurehi Buddhehi vahitabbā dhurā, tam dhuram vahana-samatthena Mahā-purisena*, Sv 896,22); *dhorayho balasampanno kalyāṇaajavanikkamo*, A I 162,14* = III 214,4* (glossed: *dhorayho ti dhuravaho*, Mp II 258,22 [*nâssa vaṇṇam parikkhare ti assa goṇassa sarīravaṇṇam na parikkhanti, dhuravahanakammam eva pana parikkhanti*, Mp II 258,25]); there is no gloss on *dhorayho* at Ap 460,26. We should not, however, expect **dhaurvahya* to become *dhorayha* in Pāli. As Brough says,[1] no one has explained why **dhaurvahya* did not produce **dhobbayha* in Pāli, although, as he says, the Pāli form might be due to a blending of **dhūrvahya-* or **dhaurvahya-* with *dhaureya-*.

Helmer Smith (Sadd, Index, p. 1470) suggests an etymology < **dhauruhya*, i.e. taking the weak grade of *vah*, and making a *vṛddhi* form from **dhur-uh*, cf. *anaḍ-uh* and *anaḍ-vāh*. We should then have to assume dissimilation of vowels, with the expected **dhoruhya* becoming

---

[1] Brough, *op. cit.*, p. 236 (ad GDhp 177).

dhorahya. Even if this is correct, it would seem to be a gloss which has entered the text.

As Brough states,[1] the forms with *vaha*, etc., are not intended as an etymology, but as an explanation, and the presence of *dhoreka* in GDhp shows clearly that in that tradition the correct reading was taken to be the equivalent of Skt *dhaureya*, the Pāli equivalent of which, i.e. *dhoreyya*, does occur at Mil 288,28 in the compound *kamma-dhoreyya*. The correct reading was also known in other traditions. Udāna-v 25.25 has *dhaureyaṃ javasampannaṃ*; AMg (Utt 14.35) has *dhoreya-sīla*; PDhp 71 has *dhoreyasīlavratamantam.*[2]

Brough points out that in some cases it can be shown that the Pāli text was already corrupt by the time the cty was made. On Dhp 390 (= GDhp 15) he states (p. 180) that many of the errors — perhaps all — were already fossilised in the present form at the time when the Pāli cty was composed, but as he points out (p. 237), the presence of the explanation of Dhp 208 does not prove that this reading was in the text available to the cty, since the spelling we have perhaps represents an attempt by the scribal tradition to explain the sense, which has led to eccentricities of spelling. It must, however, be noted that the eccentric spelling has replaced the correct spelling everywhere in the Pāli canonical texts. For such a replacement, cf. the discussion of the replacement of *bārasa* by *dvādasa* below.

Brough went on to say that although it was clear that the original reading must have been *dhoreyya-sīla*, an editor of the Pāli text would doubtless prefer to retain the corruption in the text. In saying this Brough was doubtless of the opinion that the correct reading was nowhere attested in the manuscripts of the texts (D, S, A, Dhp, Ja, Ap) in which it occurs.

---

[1] Brough, *op. cit.*, p. 236 (ad GDhp 177).

[2] See M. Cone (ed.), "Patna Dharmapada I", *JPTS* XIII, 1989, pp. 101–217.

In our new edition of the Dhp,[1] however, Professor von Hinüber and I have been able to include the reading which has long been recognised to be the correct one, because it is now attested in manuscripts from Thailand.[2]

9. *bārasa* "twelve"

OvH has pointed out that the historical MIA form of the numeral *bārasa* "12" seems not to have left any trace in Pāli except in grammatical literature, as *dvādasa* prevails throughout in the text tradition. He based his statement on the absence of the word from PED and the index to Sadd except in references to grammatical literature.[3] In my survey of numerals in MIA I expanded this slightly to "only in grammarians and late texts",[4] because it does occur in late texts, e.g. at Saddh 213[5] (where the comparable passage in the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra[6] has *dvādasa*).

The implication is, therefore, that at one time both *bārasa* and *dvādasa* were in use — or the grammarians would not have recorded the two forms — but at some time, for some reason, all canonical attestations of *bārasa* were changed to *dvādasa*. This is very strange, in as much as it is noteworthy that it is only in the numeral *dvādasa* that the change of *dv- > b-* seems not to take place in Pāli. We find it in other numerals, e.g. *bāvīsati* "22" (Kv 218,27), *battiṃsa* "32" (Ja III 207,15*), etc.

---

[1] O. von Hinüber and K.R. Norman (eds): *Dhammapada*, PTS Oxford 1994.

[2] See *ibid.* p. 59 (ad Dhp 208).

[3] O. von Hinüber, *Notes on the Pāli tradition in Burma* (Beiträge zur Überlieferungs-geschichte in Birma, I), Nachrichten der Akadamie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I. Phil. Hist. Klasse. Jg 1983, Nr. 3, 1983, pp. 74–75.

[4] "Middle Indo-Aryan Numerals", in Jadranka Gvozdanović (ed.), *Indo-European Numerals*, Berlin 1992, Chapter 6, pp. 199–241 [p. 210].

[5] Quoted in K.R. Norman, "The literary works of the Abhayagiriviharins", *Kalyāṇa-mitta* (Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume), Delhi 1991, pp. 41–50 (p. 50 note 46) (= Cp IV, pp. 202–17 [p. 213 note 4]).

[6] Upāsak 292,19.

It is therefore a matter of some interest that *bārasa* does occur in the canon, in the compound *bārasa-vassika* at Ap 498,1. Ap-a makes no comment on the form, saying (as commonly) *sesaṃ suviññeyyam eva*, which perhaps implies that at the time of the composition of Ap-a *bārasa* was a common form, and did not require any comment.

10. *sadhāyamānarūpa* "abusive"

This word occurs in Udāna V.9 (Ud 61,6,7) with reference to a number of young men who are acting in an unpleasant way. Since the verse which comes at the end of the prose refers to *bhāsā*, the unpleasantness must be concerned with the nature of their language or with shouting. Woodward translates "were using abusive speech",[1] and Ireland translates "were shouting abuse",[2] and something like that is clearly what is meant,[3] but establishing the correct form of the text is not easy. The explanation of the word is made difficult by the variety of readings which occur, and by the fact that the cty gives not only two explanations of the meaning, but also a *pāṭhāntara*. There are always problems when the cty gives and explains a variant reading, because it means that the tradition had already become confused in pre-cty times — and if the tradition did not know the original reading our chances of finding it are remote.

The readings found are as follows:

sadd- is the reading of Ud (E^e and S^e); it is also the reading of the *pāṭhāntara* in Ud-a (B^e and E^e) and it is a v.l. in Ud-a (E^e); *paṭh-* is a v.l. quoted from Ud-a in a footnote in Ud (E^e), but is not quoted as a v.l. in Ud-a (E^e); *paṭh-* is a v.l. in Ud-a (E^e); *padh-* is a v.l. in Ud (E^e); *sadh-* is

---

[1] F.L. Woodward, *Udāna: verses of uplift*, London 1935, p. 73.
[2] John D. Ireland, *The Udāna: inspired utterances of the Buddha*, Buddhist Publication Society, Kandy, 1990, p. 84.
[3] Peter Masefield (*The Udāna*, PTS Oxford 1994, p. 107) translates "in a ridiculing fashion", and notes (p. 117 note 127) that this translation is "wholly provisional".

the reading of Ud (B^e and N^e) and of Ud-a (B^e); *saddh-* is the reading of C^e (Buddha Jayantī ed.) and is a v.l. in Ud (E^e); *vadh-* is the reading of C^e (1926 as quoted in N^e) and of Ud-a (E^e and C^e).

It is probable that the readings with *p-* arise from the similarity in appearance between *pa* and *sa* in the Brāhmī script, and can therefore be disregarded. It is likely that we are dealing with *vadh-* on the one hand and *sadd-*, *saddh-* or *sadh-* on the other.

If we were to accept *vadh-* as the original reading, we should have to assume that this is *vadh-* in the sense of "harm, injure". The inclusion of the word *bhāsā* in the verse would require us to believe that *vadh-* was being used in a slightly transferred sense of "harm by abusing" which I cannot quote from elsewhere.

The Pāli grammarian Aggavaṃsa quotes a verb *sadh-* with the meaning "abuse".[1] This is said to be the equivalent of Sanskrit *śṛdh-*[2] with the same meaning, but the present indicative of this is *śardhati*, which should give a Pāli form *saddhati*. As noted above there is some evidence for the reading *saddh-*, but one would need to examine the readings very carefully to try to decide whether they are genuine forms, i.e. are based upon a genuine manuscript tradition, or not.

Ud-a (E^e) 318,17–25 reads: *te vadhāyamāna-rūpā ti uppaṇḍana-jātikaṃ vacanaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ. aññesaṃ uppaṇḍentā vadhanti, tad-attha-vacana-sīlā ti attho. tass' āyaṃ vacan'-attho: vadhanaṃ vadho taṃ ācikkhantī ti: vadhayamānā ti vattabbe, dīghaṃ katvā vadhāyamānā ti vuttaṃ. athavā vihethe vadhe viya attānaṃ ācaranti ti, vadhāyamānā. tato evaṃ sabhāvatāya vadhāyamāna-rūpā ti vuttaṃ. saddāyamāna-rūpā ti pi pāṭho. uccā-sadda-mahāsaddaṃ karontā ti attho.* This seems to be explaining the alternative readings *vadh-* , which is confirmed by the inclusion of *vihetha* in the alternative explanation, and *sadd-*. If these

---

[1] *sadhu saddakucchiyaṃ: sadhati*, Sadd 395,1.
[2] Sadd 395 note b.

two words are synonyms, then we might explain *sadd-* as being from the present stem of the root *sadh-* = Skt *śṛdh-*, i.e. *saddh-* < *śardh-* which was replaced by *sadd-* (and then explained as being connected with *sadda*) because *saddh-* looked as though it was connected with *saddhā*. We could assume that *sadd(h)-* was the original reading, and *vadh-* was a gloss which was later incorporated into the text, when the exact meaning of *sadd(h)-* was forgotten, but the idea of "harming" was deduced.

In place of the phrase *vihethe vadhe viya* in Ud-a (E[e]), B[e], C[e] and S[e] read *visesato sasedhe viya*. This means that the alternation in Ud-a (B[e]) is between *sadh-* and *sadd-*, and the word *sasedhe* occurs in the explanation of *sadh-*. It is probable that *-sedha* is connected with Skt *śṛdha*, with the same development of *ṛ* > *e* as we see in *geha* < *gṛha*. The meaning would therefore be something like "boldness", with *sa-* < *sva-*.

Shepreth   K.R. Norman

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Dr Sally Mellick Cutler,
Wolfson College,
Linton Road,
Oxford OX2 6UD.

Dr Jinadasa Liyanaratne,
31 rue de Séquigny,
F-91700 Ste.-Geneviève-des-Bois,
France.

Dr Max Nihom,
Institut für die Kultur und Geistesgeschichte Asiens,
Postgaße 7/4/3,
A-1010 Vienna,
Austria.

K.R. Norman,
6 Huttles Green,
Shepreth,
Royston,
Herts SG8 6PR.

Peter Skilling,
c/o The Siam Society,
G.P.O. Box 65,
Bangkok 10501,
Thailand.